



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE HEBREW TEXT OF BEN SIRA.

THE BRITISH MUSEUM FRAGMENTS OF
ECCLESIASTICUS.

THE REV. G. MARGOLIOUTH has well earned the thanks of all Biblical scholars by the promptitude with which he made the British Museum Fragments accessible to them. They will also feel grateful to him for the translation, notes, and vocabulary, which accompany his text. There is many an excellent hint thrown out in his commentary to the student, whilst his translation will also make the layman share in the benefits of the new discoveries. Of course it is impossible to reach finality in the first edition of a text offering so many difficulties. In the following remarks an attempt is made to offer some alternative emendations or differing explanations of the text suggested to me when studying the British Museum Fragments.

The work of Mr. Margoliouth is also headed by a short preface, in which the editor declares his belief in the authenticity of our fragments. To do this in the face of the thunderbolt from Oxford, followed by a shower of abusive and denunciatory language, poured down on the heads of all those who still maintain their allegiance to the new discoveries, requires indeed a good deal of moral courage.

Mr. Margoliouth makes also in his preface mention of my introduction to the Cambridge Fragments, saying among other things "that the Paitanic tendencies of the Hebrew text have no doubt been overstated" in it. Mr. Margoliouth does not say in what this overstating consists, and I am thus unable to enter into an argument. But I am afraid that my quotation from Professor Bacher's essay, in which the Paitanic tendency of Ben Sira was described as consisting "of ready-made expressions and phrases from the Scriptures, hereby already exhibiting that mosaic style which is characteristic of the later post-Talmudical authors," gave rise to misunderstanding. For the words in italics were taken by those who never made a study of the Paitanic literature to imply that the mosaic style never occurs before, and thus used as an argument proving the late date of our composition. In the face of such ignorance it becomes unfortunately necessary to point

out that the Paitan is by no means a post-Talmudic product. Thus R. Eleazar b. Simon, who died about the end of the second century, bore among other titles also that of Paitan¹. In the *Midrash Shir hashirim Rabbah*, I, § 7, King Solomon is credited with the accomplishment of his acrostics being complete, whilst those of the Paitanim were not always carried through the whole alphabet. How far Solomon really possessed the Paitanic gift need not be discussed here, but the passage proves beyond doubt the existence of the Paitan during the Talmudic ages. Unfortunately very little is left to us of the Paitanic productions of those earlier ages. But this little betrays the same characteristics of the mosaic and the allusive style which we know from Ben Sira on the one hand, and the later hymnology of the Synagogue on the other. Thus in the short dirge recorded in B. T. *Moed Katon*, 25 b, we have no less than seven quotations from the Bible. It runs thus:—

נוע ישישים² עלה מבבל ועמו ספר מלחמות³
קאת וקפור⁴ הוכפלו לראות בשור ושבר⁵ הבא משנער.
קצף על עולמו וחמם ממנו נפשות⁶.
ושמח בהם ככלה חדשה.
רוכב ערבות⁷ שש ושמח בבא אליו נפש נקי וצדיק⁸.

In B. T. *Abodah Zarah*, 24 b, we have again a hymn which was originally probably composed in honour of the holy ark. It consists of five lines; but the ark in it is called שיטה in allusion to Exod. xxv. 10 ועשו ארון עצי שטים, whilst the phrases בריקמי זהב and בערי עדים are borrowed from, or at least suggested by, Ps. xlv. 14 and 15 and Ezek. xvi. In the ordination song recorded in B. T. *Kethuboth*, 17 a, consisting of one line, the phrase ויעלת חן is borrowed from Prov. v. 19.

The quotations from Ben Sira to be found in the Talmud and Midrashim betray the same feature, as may be seen from the following expressions to be found in them: אשת חן (Prov. xi. 16); שמך... למסוך (Isa. v. 22); ועצומים כל הרוגיה (Prov. vii. 26); ונו' (Jer. v. 27); משובכת חיקך ונו' (Mich. vii. 5)⁹.

¹ See *Pesikta d' R. Kahana*, ed. Buber, p. 177, and parallels given there in the notes. Cf. Luzzato, מבוא למחזור בני רומא (Livorno, 1856), p. 5. Cf. also Weiss, רור רור וורשיו, III, p. 263.

² Play of words on Isa. xi. 1 מגוע ישי 1.

³ Num. xxi. 14.

⁴ Isa. xxxiv. 11.

⁵ Isa. lx. 18.

⁶ Prov. xiii. 2.

⁷ Ps. lxxviii. 5.

⁸ Exod. xxiii. 7.

⁹ This fact was already recognized by Franz Delitzsch, *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie vom Abschluss der heiligen Schrift*, &c. (Leipzig, 1836), p. 204,

The foregoing specimens will suffice to show that neither the mosaic nor the allusive style is confined to the post-Talmudic literature, the poetic remains of the Rabbis betraying the same characteristics. The Paitanic features of our fragments thus in no way point to its late composition. They only prove that this ornamental style is also pre-Talmudic. But in spite of this Paitanic similarity it must be clear to any one who is at all familiar with the Hebrew Bible, and fairly read in Rabbinic literature, that our fragments stand both in respect of vocabulary and of style quite by themselves, and must therefore come from a period from which till now no literary monument was known to us. I may also add that I have discovered in the Genizah fragments representing a Gnostic collection, written in double columns and provided with the Babylonian punctuation, and probably dating from the times of the Gaonim. I hope soon to publish them, and it will be seen that their style is as far from that of the Ben Sira fragments as these are from Proverbs and Isaiah.

I give now the notes on the British Museum fragments, following in the numbering of the verses Mr. Margoliouth's English version.

xxx. 12. [שלחן גדול] Aboth d' R. Nathan, I, c. 27, *סידור של שלחן גדול*. Some MSS. omit the *של*, but the meaning is obscure. B. T. *Abodah Zarah*, 38 a, *שלחן מלכים*. *Perek R. Meir*, 'של' של *מל'*.

13 d, e. [מפני כל] It was suggested by Perles and Ryssel that this was the original. *Eccelus*. xiv. 10 *ומעין יבש יול מים* (cf. Num. xxiv. 7, Syr. there in *Eccelus*. (ירלם) suggests that the original reading here was *דמעה מעל כל פנים* cf. Isa. xxv. 8 *ומפנים דמעה תרמע*. *תחיל* see also *Eccelus*. xii. 16 c *בעיני ירמיע*.

14. Cf. *Derech Eretz Rabbah*, c. 7, *על שלחן אחד*, שנים שהיו יושבין על שלחן אחד, *יד תחלה ואחר כך הקטן ואם שלח הרי זה גרנרן*.

15. . . . r] Gl. Supply *Ayin* and *He*, so as to read *רעה*, used in the same sense as *Eccelus*. xxxviii. 1 (*רעי* or *רופא*), to cultivate, to honour. *Pirke Aboth*, II, 10 *יהי כבוד חברך חביב עליך כשלך*. *Var.* *תלמידך*. *ובכל ששנאת התבונן* in order to avoid it. Cf. the well-known saying of Hillel *עלך כני לחברך לא תעביר*. B. T. *Shubbath* 31 a.

16. *הסב* & c.] Cf. *Eccelus*. xxxii. 1 Gr. Hebrew. *תעט* Cf. xiv. 10. *נבון* Gl. Prob. corruption of *נבון*. Cf. below, verse 19.

Anm. 1, where he speaks of the "*musivisch angebrachten Bibelsprüche*" in Ben Sira. Dukes in his *Rabbinische Blumenlese*, p. 32, also draws attention to the "*eigenthümliche Sitte, Biblische Stellen wörtlich in die Diction einzuflechten*," and proceeds to say, "*Wir finden diese Sitte bereits im Sirach und nachher im Buche der Weisheit, im Buche Henoch sowie im Neuen Testament.*"

17. . . בע.] Perhaps מוסר בעד "for the sake of good manners." Cf. Ecclus. xxxii. 2 b, c.

18.]רע The parallel passages in *Derech Eretz Rabbah*, c. 7 (see above), and *Tosephta Berachoth* (ed. Zuckermann), p. 12, no. 7, would suggest the emendation ראש גדול = ראש.

19.]ישיק Cf. Ecclus. xliii. 4, Gl.

20 c, d.]הפוכות Perhaps חשוכות, cf. *Mechilta* (ed. Friedmann), p. 48 a, בפנים חשכות.

20 a, b.]שנה plur. of שנה Cf. Ecclus. xxx. 25, text and note.

22 c, d.]צנוע Cf. Ecclus. xvi. 25, xxxii. 3. B.T. *Berachoth*, 62 a, צנוע באורחתיו.

21 a, b.]קיה קיה Cf. Jer. xxv. 27 Keri קיו Kethib קו. See also Gesenius (vomit). The matter was by no means so uncommon with the Jews as Edersheim believes, cf. B.T. *Shabbath*, 147 b, the discussion about the אפיקטוזין.

22 a, b.]ובאחרית חשי אמרי Cf. Ecclus. xii. 12 c.

23.]רעת, Gl.]עדות Cf. introduction to the Cambridge Fragments by S. Schechter, p. 31, note 3—נאמנה . . . עדות. Cf. Ps. xix. 8.

24.]רועו Cf. Ecclus. xii. 10.

25. Cf. Isa. v. 22 and Eccles. x. 27.

26.]לומש For which the Gr. read טובל.]למצות For which some Gr. MSS. had probably לבות, whilst the Syr. read למרות (taken in the sense of embittering and exciting). Possibly the original reading was למסות. The connexion of לצים with wine was probably suggested by Prov. xx. 1 לץ היין.

27 a, b.]למי Read (as suggested by Perles) כמו.

27 c, d.]בראשית Syr. מן רישיתא. Cf. Ecclus. xv. 14 מבראשית, where the Syr. has מן בראשית.]וראי Read ראוי, part. pass. of ראה, occurring frequently in Rabbinical literature, meaning proper, suitable, and qualified. Cf. *Mishnah Yoma*, c. 8, 2 ראוי לשתיה 2, משקין . . . ראוי לשתיה.

29.]לענה Probably alluding to Isa. xxix. 9 ימר שבר לשתי 9, which word the Syr. somehow connected with עני "poverty."

30. The Gr. for מוקשת in Ecclus. xxxii. 20 is ἀντίτροπα, cf. Ryssel to this verse.]פצע Cf. Prov. xxiii. 29.

xxxvi. 19.]מטעמי דבר Cf. Ecclus. xxx. 25 and xxxvii. 29. It is not impossible that the Gr. read הֶפֶר in the sense of שור הבר (*taurus silvester*), cf. Levy, *Dict.*, s. בר II.]זבר Gl., cf. Ecclus. xl. 29 c, Gl.

20.]לבי עקוב Cf. Jer. xvii. 9, cf. also Ecclus. vi. 20.]ישיבנה בו Gr. לו for בו, whilst the Syr. probably had ביננה for 'יש. Cf., however, Prov. xii. 25, and see also Strack's comm. on it, which would suggest ישמחנה.

18. כַּל נִכְח וְנִי. This verse forms a doublet to ver. 18 in the Cambridge Fragments (on p. 16 of the text). Cf. for the Syr. Cambridge Fragments, *ibid.*, Gl.

22. יִהְיֶה לֵל Gl., so Syr., Gr. יִצְהִיל, cf. Ps. civ. 15.

23. מִרְפָּא לְשׁוֹן Prov. xv. 4.

25. נֶנַע וְנֵר Cf. Prov. xxiv. 30, 31. Gen. iv. 14.

26. בַּצְבָּאוֹת . . . מִדְּלֵג . . . רֹמְמָה דּוּרִי 7-9 Cant. ii. &c.] גִּדּוּר צִבָּא הַמִּדְּלֵג לְצַבִּי, of which words the Syr. translator was thinking.

xxxvii. 1. שֶׁם Gl. Cf. Ecclus. vi. 17 b.

2. כִּנְפֵשׁ Gl. Cf. Ecclus. xxx. 21, 23, xxxviii. 18, text and notes. Gl., cf. Ecclus. vii. 21.

3. הָיוּ יָרַע אֲמַר מ' כ' נִוצַרֶת This is probably the original correct reading. Syr. suggests שְׁנָאָה, whilst the Gr. misread נִוצַרֶת (from רוֹץ) for נִוצַרֶת.

4. מֶרַע [מֶרַע . . . שֶׁלֹּחַן] The strange conceived differently by the Gr. and the Syr. (see commentaries) read originally מָה יָרַע "what is a friend who is only a ש' א' ש' " (= אֹהֶב מ' א' ש' = חֶבֶר שֶׁלֹּחַן in Ecclus. vi. 10).

5. זֵר Gl. Syr. perhaps זֵר (cf. Ecclus. xli. 19 c, text and Gl.), whilst the Gr. possibly read נִוִּיר, but translating it rather freely. Cf. Ecclus. xlv. 7 b.

6. הַמִּשְׁלַל בְּכָל בִּשְׁלַל לָךְ Read by the Syr. בִּשְׁלַל לָךְ, cf. Gen. xxiv. 2. הַמִּשְׁלַל and xxxix. 4.

7. וְהִנֵּי יָדוֹ Cf. Ecclus. xii. 18 (of the hypocritical friend) יָנִיף יָד.

8 a, b. צִוְּרֵכוֹ Perhaps we should read also in *Derech Eretz Zuta*, c. 8, דִּרְכוֹ for צִוְּרֵכוֹ.

8 c, d. לִמָּה זֶה אֵלָיו Gen. xviii. 13 &c. יָפֹל must relate to some noun in the first clause now missing.

9. רִישֶׁךְ Gl. רִישֶׁךְ. Cf. Prov. vi. 11; xxiv. 32.

11 b. וּמִדֵּר Syr. suggests וּמִצֵּר. Gr. (לֵב). וּמִדֵּר.

11 c. מִסֹּחֵר Cf. Fritzsche's Com. to Ecclus. xlii. 5. [תַּחְנֵר] Read תַּחְנֵר or תַּגְרָה (bargain), cf. Ecclus. xlii. 5 c (תַּגְרָה), ed. Smend. Cf. also Levy, s. תַּגְרָה and Kohut s. תַּגְרָה. Cf. Ecclus., *ibid.*, ed. Smend.

11 f. תַּנְמָל Point תַּנְמָל.

11 g, h. שׁוֹמֵר שׁוֹא Cf. Ps. cxxvii. 1. שׁוֹמֵר שׁוֹא. It is more likely that the שׁוֹא slipped in from the first clause and the use should read שׁוֹמֵר שֶׁבֶר (B. T. *Baba Mezia*, 93 b, in contradistinction to the שׁוֹמֵר שֶׁבֶר (פּוֹעֵל שׁוֹא = חֵנֶם *συντέλεια*).

12 a, b. שׁוֹמֵר מִצְוָה Prov. xix. 16.

12 c, d. אִם תִּבְשֹׁל וְנִי Cf. Ecclus. xii. 15, text and notes, and xiii. 7. וְהַתְּעֵבֵר בָּךְ.

13. עצות מרחוק אמונה אמן Cf. Isa. xxv. 1 אמן Cf. Isa. xxv. 1 אמן ממנו.
 14. [שעיותיו] Cf. Ecclus. xxxviii. 25 c, text and notes. See also Dr. Taylor's note to Ecclus. xiii. 6.
 15. [יכין . . . צעדיך] Cf. Ps. xxxvii. 23 and Prov. xvi. 9.
 16. [מאמר] Gl. Cf. Ecclus. iii. 8.
 17. [עקרת] Gl. עקר. Gr. עֶקֶב or עֶקֶב. Cf. Ecclus. xiii. 26.
 18. המות וחיים Cf. Ecclus. xv. 17. [לשון] Cf. Prov. xviii. 21 וחיים ונ'.
 ביר לשון.
 19. [נואל] The נמאם in the next verse suggests that the נואל has to be taken in the sense of defiling oneself (see Hebrew Dict.), though it does not occur in the *Kal* in this sense. Cf. the Rabbinical phrase of נאה דורש ואין נאה מקיים (*Tosephta Jebamoth*, 250).
 20. [ודבריו מכווערין] Cf. Ecclus. xiii. 22 a בדבריו ומאם.

P.S. I take here the opportunity of adding the corrections of a few misprints, as well as a few comments on the text occurring to me after the volume of the Cambridge Fragments passed the press.

- Text, p. 11, ch. xxxii. 1 b, c, Gl. ובכין read ובכ.
 P. 18. Add the number 38 against line 18.
 P. 21, ver. 24. פינחם read פינחם.
 Introduction, p. 34 (at the top). מירא read מירא.
 Notes, p. 39, ver. 19 b. Add "cf. Ps. xxv. 14 and Prov. iii. 32."
 Ibid., n. 21. Add "cf. also Jerushalmi, *Sotah*, c. 7, § 5, and parallels אין לכם עסק בנסתרות."
 P. 40, n. 31. Add "ברכיו", so Syr., Gr. אחריתו, cf. Ryssel to Ecclus. ii. 3, xx. 25, 26, and Perles to xlvi. 20. Probably some MSS. had ארחותיו for ברכיו, which the Gr. again read אחריתו. Cf. Ecclus. xxxii. 22 and 22 (1)."
 Ibid., ch. iv. n. 1. Add "cf. Prov. xiv. 31 עשק דל and xvii. 5 לענ 5 לרש, which verses are mere doublets."
 P. 41, n. 15. Add "אמת, Gr. אמת."
 P. 42, n. 30. Cancel the words "and Syr."
 P. 43, ch. vi, n. 2. "אל תנודל, Gr. אל תפול."
 P. 44, n. 17 b. Add "see also Ecclus. ii. 18, Syr. ואיד שמא הכנא עברוהי."
 Ibid., n. 22. Add "see also Ecclus. xxi. 19. Ryssel to this verse: 'Im Hebräischem Text bildete מוסרים bzw. מוסרות einen Anklang an מוסר.'"
 P. 47, n. 11 a. Add "ישמע" *Nifal*, having the meaning of obedience and subjection; cf. Levy and Kohut s. שמע."
 P. 48, ch. xiii, n. 11 a. Add "cf. *Pirke Aboth*, I, 7 ואל תתחבר לרשע.

This would suggest to read לחבר instead of להפש, for which the Syr. had לְדַבֵּר."

P. 51, n. 19. Add "cf. רקוב, Syr. wrongly ברוק."

Ibid., n. 10. Add "cf. *Pereth R. Meir* וממשלה ונותנת לו מלכות. Cf. also New Testament, Matt. vii. 29."

P. 52, ch. xv, n. 15. Add "cf. Ps. xl. 10 לעשות רצונו. With regard to ותבונה it is not impossible that it represents the imperf. *Pual* of בָּנָה, and should thus be pointed ותבִּינָה or ויתבִּינָה, meaning 'to be well-proportioned, suited,' cf. Levy, s., and Jastrow, s. בָּנָה (about the Rabb. מבִּינָה). It must, however, be noticed that the meaning of the word is not quite clear, cf. Kohut, *Aruch Hushalem*, s. בִּן (II), p. 110."

P. 55, n. 6. Add "cf. Ecclus. viii. 2."

P. 55-57, n. 5. Add "cf. *משפט שיר*, Gr. *σύνκριμα μουσικῶν*. The term *σύνκριμα* occurs below verse 17 for תורה (see notes), which is synonymous with משפט and חוק. Hence מזמור על חוק below in Ecclus. lxiv. 5, meaning music or song in measured tunes and according to rules. Cf. Ryssel *a. l.*"

P. 57, n. 5 (1). Read דברים instead of דברים.

P. 62, n. 25 c. Add "cf. Ecclus. xxii. 6 Syr."

P. 63, ch. 1, n. 1 a. Add "גרול אחיו. Cf. Lev. xxi. 10."

P. 66, n. 4 b. Read נופח instead of נפחו.

P. 65, n. 27 c. Add "It is also possible that we should read נבע ביאור לָבו. Cf. Ecclus. xxiv. 27 Syr., and xlvi. 14 ותצף ביאור מוסר." ביאור לָבו.

P. 68, n. 27. Add "ולא תבוש", cf. Ecclus. xxiv. 22 Gr."

Ibid., n. 29. Add after בשיבתי "For a similar confusion by the LXX in 1 Sam. xii. 2 see Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*, p. lx." ביאור לָבו.

S. SCHECHTER.

NOTES ON THE CAMBRIDGE FRAGMENTS OF ECCLESIASTICUS.

THE following observations on the new "fragments of Sirach," the edition of which by Prof. Schechter and Dr. Taylor forms so important a continuation to the Oxford edition by Dr. Neubauer and Mr. Cowley, have a threefold object in view. In the first section I have endeavoured, by means of emendations of the text, to give new, and perhaps more

satisfactory, explanations of such passages of the Hebrew fragments as appear not to have been satisfactorily elucidated by the editors. In doing so, I have, as a matter of course, constantly taken into consideration the two ancient versions, the Greek (G) and the Syriac (S). In the second section, some passages of both these versions are elucidated by the light of the Hebrew original before us. The third section is devoted to the discussion of the relationship between the quotations, contained in the Talmudic and Midrashic literature, and in Saadiah's works, taken from the Hebrew Ben-Sira, and the fragments of the Geniza. The fragments contained in the Oxford edition offer only occasionally passages which were also known from ancient quotations, whilst the Cambridge edition contains a great number of such. This renders the fragments contained in the Cambridge edition particularly important for questions of criticism connected with the Hebrew Sirach. Another point which makes the latter edition of particular value in this respect is this, that the fragments are taken from two entirely different MSS. At the time when the fragments of the Oxford edition, and of a portion of the Cambridge edition, were written, there were still extant several copies of the Hebrew Sirach, as is evident from the marginal notes, and, particularly, from the remarks of the copyist written in the Persian language. We become acquainted with such a copy from the fragments designated as MS. A. It is externally distinguished from the other MS., for it is not, like the latter, written as verse. In this we see a relaxation of the care which was formerly devoted to the Hebrew Sirach. Saadiah made use of a copy which was still furnished, like the Bible, with vowel-points and accents. One of the MSS. of the Geniza fragments, although devoid of the latter, is still written as verse, whereas the other has even given up the latter mode of writing. The Hebrew Sirach fell at last entirely into oblivion. We recovered it as through a miracle. I believe that the following observations will contribute to silence further scepticism as to the genuineness of the Hebrew Sirach and the artificial hypotheses by which it is tried to prove the late composition of the fragments¹.

¹ In the *Guardian* for Nov. 8, 1899, Prof. Margoliouth refers to my article in this REVIEW (XII, 92-108), but only touches one detail. He shows that the expression *sukhūn afshāndan* does really occur in Persian. I freely admit this, and regret that I erroneously stated that the phrase is not to be found in Vullers. That, however, I laid no stress on the point may be at once seen from my further remark: "It is not impossible that it was used in the sense of speaking." I regard it as a strong testimony to the general force of my criticism of Prof. Margoliouth that he can only fix on a slip like this, and makes no rejoinder to my main attack.

Since the above article was written, M. Israel Lévi has published in the

I. ON THE HEBREW TEXT.

Emendations and Explanations.

(1) iii. 23. In reference to 'וביותר מ' Prof. Schechter points to Ecclesiastes xii. 12, and in reference to תמר to Exodus xxiii. 21. Dr. Taylor adopts this identification of תמר with תמר in Exodus xxiii. 21, and translates: "and intrude not into that which is beyond thee." But his translation does not in any way answer to either of the words יותר and תמר. I see no possibility of getting any sense out of תמר, or of finding a connexion between that word and the corresponding expressions in G and S. Undoubtedly we have here a corrupted reading. Instead of תמר there was originally the word תעמק, which was misread by S as תעמק, and rendered ⲧⲉⲙⲕⲁⲓ. It remains a question whether the verb περιεργάζομαι in G rests also on the reading תעמק, or whether it is a free translation of תעמק. The sentence תעמק אל תעמק מן would mean: "Do not enter deeply into that which is too much for thee—which is beyond thy understanding." יותר מן means about the same as רב מן in the second section of the verse, which says: "for more has been shown thee than is fit for thee." This means: "Since thou gettest anyhow to see much that is beyond thy understanding, it is unnecessary for thee to try and penetrate things which are altogether inaccessible to thee." G read מעשיך (ⲙⲉⲥⲓⲭⲁ ⲉⲡⲣⲥⲟⲩⲥⲟⲩ) instead of מן, S read even מעשיו (ⲙⲉⲥⲓⲱⲩⲱ), referring to God). The word corresponding in S to יותר is ⲙⲉⲃⲗ, therefore יותר.

(2) iv. 1. Originally, the second section of the verse read probably thus:—

ואל תדאיב עיני מר נפש

Cf. Ps. lxxxviii. 10: עיני ראבה מני עני. In G we have the translation of עיני (ὀφθαλμούς). But in H עני was turned into עני, and accordingly

Revue des Études Juives the opening parts of an article in which, with many other and far more serious arguments than Prof. Margoliouth's, he essays to prove the spuriousness of the Cairene text. It does not appear to me appropriate to deal with M. Lévi's arguments until they are complete. I hope, however, that in my present article I have given some positive grounds in favour of the authenticity of the text. It will be the duty of those who maintain the authenticity to bring into line with the striking facts confirmative of their position those other phenomena on which the opponents of the text justify their scepticism. The problem is certainly a difficult one. But I do not think that it can be solved by discarding the good with the bad, and by holding that the Geniza fragments are the work of a medieval Hebraist.

a ו was inserted before נפש, and the verb was supplemented by the object נפש (cf. נפש דאבה, Jer. xxxi. 24). Thus the text became נפש נפש עני ומר נפש. S renders the original text, but also reading עֲנִי instead of עֲנִי. סלא אלהיפ אבסחא סמא.

(3) iv. 2. Originally, the verse ran most likely thus:—

נֶפֶשׁ חֲסִירָה אֶל תִּפִּיחַ וְאֶל תִּתְעַלֵּם מִמְדַּכְדְּכֵי רוּחַ.

The first section is still found thus in G: ψυχὴν πεινώσαν μὴ λυπήσῃς; cf. LXX to Job xxxi. 39 (הַפְחִיתִי = ἐλύπησα). תפּיחַ was erroneously turned into תפּוּחַ. For דכאי רוח cf. ממדכ' רוח, Ps. xxxiv. 19. The word דווח at the beginning of the verse is an error for רוּחַ, as Prof. Schechter also observes; this רוּחַ is probably an old marginal note, belonging to נפש' ממד', as the present Hebrew text has, instead of ממד' רוּחַ. Besides, רוּחַ before נפש was also the reading in the text from which S translated: נפלא! שמע! לה לא אלא וססו.

(4) iv. 7 b. ולשלטון עוד הכאף ראש. The adverb עוד (Dr. Taylor translates "moreover") has no meaning here. The original reading was perhaps עיר, as apparent from S (ועבסא). S renders שלטון in the plural, perhaps in view of Ecclesiastes vii. 19 (שלימים . . . בעיר). In G עיר is not translated.

(5) iv. 13. Prof. Schechter and Dr. Taylor explain ויחנו as Niphal of חנן. More correct is the reading rendered in S, וַיִּחְנוּ, "They will encamp in the blessing of God," which bears the meaning of, "wherever they encamp, God's blessing is with them." G also renders the passage in this sense.

(6) iv. 19. Prof. Schechter says: "ונטותהו" probably corruption of "ונטה מאתי." This conjecture is reproduced by Dr. Taylor in his translation, although he queries it. We must read rather ונטשתיהו¹. G read also this word (ἐγκαταλείψει). Cf. ויטש, Deut. xxxii. 15, LXX ἐγκατέλιπε, &c. The second version of this verse in H has אשליכנו for ונטשתיהו, corresponding in this, as also otherwise, with S (ושכססו).

(7) iv. 27. תמאן is here meaningless: read תמוט. The sentence reads then, ואל תמוט לפני מושלים, both expression and sense being in accordance with Prov. xxv. 26: מוט לפני רשע. Instead of לפני תמוט G read, תשא פני; S (אליסב אבסא) seems to have had another word which is rendered "to contend," "to struggle."

(8) v. 4. Prof. Schechter suggests ומה for ומי; Dr. Taylor adopts the suggestion, but queries it. The emendation is unnecessary and

¹ This was also conjectured by Smend.

incorrect, for the subject to יעשה is God, as mentioned in the second section of the verse (כי אל ארך אפים הוא). In reality, ומה יעשה לי is a compound question, a combination of ומה יעשה לי and מאומה לא יעשה לי. Cf. Ps. xiii. 2: עד אנה י' תשכחני נצח, a combination of אל תשכחני נצח and עד אנה י' תשכחני. G takes no notice of מאומה, and translates: *kai tí moi égyévero* (יעשה for נעשה); S translates מאומה also, and expresses the interrogative word by a negative: ומה יעשה לי (יעשה). Besides, the question ומה יעשה לי can really have been meant to express the negation; cf. Job ix. 2; xxv. 4.

(9) v. 17. תתעבר can have no connexion with מתעבר in Proverbs xiv. 16, as Prof. Schechter thinks; nor is his other suggestion tenable, to read תתעבר, in accordance with the Syriac. תתעבר seems to have the meaning of "to delay," "to draw on," although it cannot be proved that it has this meaning anywhere else. We might refer to Jeremiah xlvi. 16 העביר מועד, or the Talmudic *Joma*, 32 b). As a matter of fact, S translates infra, vii. 10, the sentence *ובצדקה אל תתעבר*, and *סעע וימל לא למס*; just as in our passage the word תאחר, parallel to תתעבר, is rendered *למס*. It is true S renders the word תתעבר in our passage by *לחב*, from which we must not, however, infer that H also had תתעבר, and applied in a sense quite foreign to the Hebrew root עבר. The Syriac root עבר, in the sense of "to keep back," "to hinder," accords with the new-Hebrew and Aramaic עכב, and our expression תתעבר is really equivalent to תתעכב. The expression אל תתעבר, bearing the same meaning ("do not hesitate," "do not delay"), is also found in H in xxxviii. 9. G translates it in v. 7 *μη υπερβάλλου* ("do not put off"); in vii. 10 *μη παρίδης* ("do not neglect"); in xxxviii. 9 *μη παράβλεπε*; in vii. 16 *יתעבר*, *χρονεῖ*.

(10) v. 13. Dr. Taylor translates מפלתו, "is his fall." Thus he explains מפלתו as a noun, and in doing so he follows G (*πτῶσις αὐτῷ*); S translates *ומל חס*, and consequently takes it to be a verb. In that case, מפלתו would be a participle Hiphil. "The tongue of man causes him to fall." Cf. *Aboda Zara*, 11 b: הכשילן פיהם, "their own tongue made them stumble," caused them to fall.

(11) vi. 7. Prof. Schechter suggests to read בניין for בניין. The correction into נפוי would be more simple. For the word נפוי, active noun from נפה, occurs in H elsewhere; vide xxxiii. 1 and xlv. 20. But נסין occurs also in xiii. 11; and the plural, נסיונות, in iv. 17.

(12) vi. 11. וברעתך יתנדה ממך, "In thy misfortune he keeps far

from thee." S translates **מנדיכם**, like **מנדיכם**, Isa. lxvi. 5, which the Targum renders by **מרחקיבון**. G reads **יבעבדך יתגדל** or **יבעבדיך יתגדל**.

(13) vi. 20. **עקיבה** is the feminine of **עקב**, Isa. xl. 4. G translates it **παχέα**, the same word with which **הרכסים**, in Isa. xl. 4, an expression parallel to **העקב**, is translated.

(14) vi. 22. This verse was until now unintelligible in the versions, since neither from G nor S the allusion, contained in the name of Wisdom, could be understood. H offers the solution of the riddle. Not **חכמה**, but **מוסר**, is spoken of. But the allusion, which is contained directly in the word **מוסר**, cannot be found in the way Dr. Taylor explains it in his note. It would be too artificial, and the section of the verse would not be quite intelligible. I believe that **מוסר** is compared with a word which has an equal sound, and is the participle Hophal of **סור** (vide Isa. xvii. 1): **כֵּן הוּא** (read **כשמו**) **כשמה**, "The discipline is like its name," i.e. **מוסר**, remote, distant, not accessible to many. In the continuation of the sentence, **ולא לרבים היא נכוחה**, "Wisdom," which is the subject of the whole passage, is substituted for "discipline," which is also meant to express as much as "Wisdom" (cf. Prov. i. 2, 7 **חכמה ומוסר**), hence the feminine construction. The meaning is either: "It is not straight for many," i.e. "not easily accessible"—in that case **נכוחה** (a synonym of **ישרה**) is in contrast to **עקיבה** in ver. 20—or, the one indicated by the punctuation of the word **נֹכַחָהּ** **היא לרבים היא**, "it is not destined for many"—in which case **נכוחה** is the passive of **הִנִּיחַ**, in the same meaning which it bears in Gen. xxiv. 14, 44.

(15) vii. 15. Instead of **תאיין**, read **תקוין**, cf. iv. 9 and vi. 25.

(16) vii. 16. **זכור עברון לא יתעבר**. The correct reading is undoubtedly **עֲבְרוֹן** (G **ὑπέρ**, S **فيسل**), a form which occurs nowhere else, and is equivalent to **עברה** (in the meaning of **עברה**, Zeph. i. 15, Prov. xi. 4; cf. Isa. xiii. 9). The word was formed, perhaps, in analogy to **חָרוֹן**. Cf. also xxx. 23, **קצפון**. The word **עברון** is a play upon the word **יתעבר**, which is used in the sense indicated supra, v. 7. Cf. Sirach's play upon words, supra, vi. 22. For other instances in H, see xlvi. 17 and 20: **יחזקיהו חזק עיר**; **וישעם ביד ישעיהו**. Cf. on this subject Prof. Schechter's remark, on p. 30 of his introduction.

(17) vii. 18. Messrs. Schechter and Taylor's remarks in explanation of the word **תלוי** are very much forced, both in regard to

¹ Vid. also xlvi. 22 **כי עשה יחזקיהו את השב ויחזק ברכי דור** (Isr. Lévi, *L'Ecclesiastique*, p. 142).

grammar and context¹, and offer, besides, no possibility of understanding the translation of the word in S and G. I think I am able to solve the enigma in the following manner. תלוי is corrupted from שלם. אָח שָׁלֵם means "sincere brother," equivalent to אח תמים. Cf. לב שלם, "an upright heart"; the Aramaic שְׁלֵים corresponds to the Hebrew תָּמִים. G translates אח שלם most aptly ἀδελφὸν γνήσιον, "a genuine brother" ("genuine" in its moral meaning of "loyal"). S reads אח שלך instead of אח שלם and translates אַחְיָהְךָ, "the brother whom you have."

(18) xii. 3. In order to understand the words אין טובה למנוח רשע, Prof. Schechter assumes here the use of an Arabism, and thinks that למנוח is a form of the word מנח (from which מְנַחֵה is derived) in the sense of "making a present." But this is unnecessary, it is sufficient to read למנוח instead of למנוח to obtain the meaning of the phrase. הַיָּחִיד with the accusative means "to afford rest, pleasure"; cf. Prov. xix. 17. וְיִנְיָהָ. Our phrase means therefore, "no good comes to one who affords rest to the wicked." S has the same reading, although it is freely translated by כְּבוֹד ("honours"). G reads apparently אין טובה לפניה רשע, "one who leaves wickedness to remain," i.e. "who persists in wickedness" (τῷ ἐνδεδεχίζοντι εἰς κακά). The second section of the verse tallies very well with the first עשה לא וגם צדקה. The meaning is "he who affords rest to the wicked has not even done an act of benevolence." But G takes this phrase as co-ordinate with the words למנוח רשע, καὶ τῷ ἐλεημοσύνην μὴ χαριζομένῳ. It seems that S only guessed at the meaning he produces. The emendation of וגם into וגוי is unnecessary and incorrect.

(19) xiii. 6. Instead of והשע, read והשיא; לך is to be taken as an accusative. לך = והשיאך, "he beguiles thee, leads thee astray." Thus G also translates καὶ ἀποπλανήσει σε. The words עד אשר יועיל צורך לו עמך והשיא לך in the next verse are only a doublet of יהתלך בתך, יהתלך being synonymous with ישיא.

(20) xiii. 24. על פי זרן cannot mean "the poverty in the mouth of presumptuousness." This would make no sense. על פי has the plain meaning of "over," "on the top of," an emphatic extension of the preposition על, like על פני, which occurs frequently in the Mishnah. S translates correctly עַל הַפִּי, "poverty over presumptuousness," i.e. "poverty, which has presumptuousness behind it." But G took על פי in its literal meaning, and זרן as an *abstractum pro*

¹ Smend (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1899, col. 507), when rendering the word by "devoted to," follows Dr. Taylor's explanation. But how can חלי possibly have such a meaning?

concreto, "in the mouth of the godless" (ἐν στόμασιν ἀσεβούς), and thus Dr. Taylor also translates it.

(21) xiv. 14. חמנע must not be read as Kal (חַמְנֵעַ), as Dr. Taylor does ("refuse not"), but as Ni'phal (חִמְנֵעַ), cf. Num. xxii. 16. Therefore, "Do not refrain thyself from the good which the day brings thee," "do not deny it to thyself." S translates correctly, לא אכלא (the same also Peshitta to Num. xxii. 16). G gives a free translation.

(22) xiv. 15. לִיְדִי נורל. Prof. Schechter refers to Joel iv. 3 (יְדִי ג'). The more correct reading is לִיְרִי, in reference to Josh. xviii. 6 ירירי לכם נורל.

(23) xiv. 16. Instead of לכפי, which makes no sense, read, in accordance with the marginal note, לפני. The phrase reads then, וכל דבר שיפה לעשות לפני אלהים עשה. This must not be translated as Dr. Taylor does, but לפני אלהים belongs to יפה, and thus it is quite properly taken in S. Cf. טוב לפני האלהים, Eccles. vii. 26. In reference to the formation of the sentence cf. Eccles. ix. 10, כל אשר תמצא בך לעשות בבחך עשה, v. also 1 Chron. xvii. 2; 1 Sam. xiv. 36.

(24) xiv. 24. Instead of יתריו, read יתרו, "his pin." "To drive one's pin in her (Wisdom's) wall" seems to have been a proverbial phrase. One who drives his pin in the wall of a house—say, to hang his tools on (cf. Isa. xxii. 13 sq.)—has obtained a footing in the house, is at home there. Cf. the phrase in Ezra ix. 8, ולתת לנו יתר, במקום קדשו. G also translates יתרו (in the singular), πάσσαλον. S reads יתריו (a plural form, which, though not attested, is yet possible, for יתריות), and translates in the plural حشوات.

(25) xiv. 25. ושכן טוב. Dr. Taylor reads apparently טוב שכן, for he translates, "in good neighbourhood." This is grammatically impossible. Read ושכן טוב, שכן being the *nomen actionis* from שכן. Cf. לשכנו, Deut. xii. 5. S translates correctly وسكننا محبا, and thus also G καταλύσει ἐν καταλύματι αγαθῶν, where we must read, of course, αγαθῶ.

(26) xv. 16. The figure of fire and water, by which the freedom of human will is metaphorically expressed, reminds us of the well-known simile of the two ways, the one of burning fire and the other of snow, but it is applied to the symbolization of another idea. On the simile (*Aboth di R. Nathan*, XXVIII, p. 86, ed. Schechter) vid. *Die Agada der Tanaiten*, ii. 196, n. 4. Instead of מוצק לפניך we ought probably to read מוצנ לפניך. Cf. infra xxx. 18, מצננה לפני. But S had the reading מונח, pronounced מנח from מניח, and, therefore, translates محض. G translates παρέθηκε σοι, which may be an active rendering of מנח. Ryssel, ad loc. (*Die Apokryphen und Pseudepi-*

graphen des Alten Testaments . . . , von E. Kautzsch, p. 307), observes rightly that the Greek words are equivalent to הָיִים לְפָנֶיךָ. But the further observation, "S ('we are left thee') read this erroneously as הָלִים, and therefore translated it 'to leave,'" is unintelligible. It is just הָיִים which means "to leave," whereas הָיִים means "to afford rest."

(27) xvi. 11. For יניה יניה read יניה, i.e. יָנִים. Cf. in regard to יניה רנוו the expression והניחותי חמתי, Ezek. xxi. 22, and elsewhere.

(28) xvi. 12. In regard to בקצות רוחות כל בני אדם cf. מקצות העם, 1 Kings xii. 31. S translates בקצות, חבל, which may be a free translation; and we need not assume that he read בינות.

(29) xvi. 22. Messrs. Schechter and Taylor's conjectures as to חוק אצוק are unsatisfactory. אצוק is an error for אצור. Cf. as to אצור חוק the expression אצרה אצור, Ps. cxix. 145, and elsewhere. We gain thus the following very clear phrase, "What hope is there, if I observe the law?" In S the whole verse is missing. G read perhaps עצור "restrained," i.e. "distant."

(30) xvi. 23. ונבר ע תה יחשב זאת. The abbreviations תה and ע must, in accordance with G (*ἄφρων καὶ πλανώμενος*), be supplemented thus: ונבר ע[ל] [ת]ועה יחשב זאת. S reproduces only the first epithet, and renders it with the similar term, חפלא. G read אויל.

(31) xvi. 26. For כברא read בברא, i.e. בְּבָרָא. G has instead, ἐκρίσει, for which, however, already Felix Perles (*Revue des Études Juives*, XXXV, 37) read correctly, after S (כָּבַר), ἐκ κρίσει, which is a verbal translation of בְּבָרָא.

(32) xxx. 22. For אפו read ימיו, and not חיי, as Prof. Schechter suggests.

(33) xxxi. 4. ואם ינוח לא נחה לו. Here we have a play upon words, as it seems, between ינוח in the meaning of "to rest," and the phrase לא נוחה לו, "he does not like it," "it is no advantage to him." The phrase occurs elsewhere only in the masculine, . . . נוח לו (vid. Levy, III, 255 b). The meaning is, "When the poor rests—i.e. 'does not work'—it is no advantage to him," because he must suffer want in consequence. This is thus distinctly expressed in the parallel verse, immediately preceding this, יהיה צריך, and so also translated by G and S. This use of צריך, when occurring without explanatory word, in the sense of "suffering want," "needy," is also found in the Haggadah of Passover, כל דצריך לייתי וליכול. It is an Aramaic phrase (vid. *Taanith*, 20 b).

(34) xxxi. 5. The marginal note reads א' במחיר for אוהב מחיר. This is the same construction of אהב as in Eccles. v. 9 בהמון אהב.

(35) xxxii. 3. For הוא לך read יאה לך (vid. Jer. x. 7). G *πρέπει σοι* (cf. LXX to Ps. xciii. 5 *πρέπει* = נאווה).

(36) xxxii. 4. ובל is abbreviated from ובלא. S had also עת ובל, but read erroneously עת ובל (ספסל חב).

(37) xxxii. 8. כל belongs neither to כול nor to כלה, as Prof. Schechter tries to explain it, but to כלל. We must read כל (cf. גל from גלל), the imperative of כלל, "to comprise." כל לאמר (the ל is the sign of the accusative) means, "Take the speech comprehensively." Cf. the phrases, כולל דברים, דברים שנכללו, Levy, II, 337 sq. G translates this very well by κεφαλαιώσων λόγον. The following ומעט הרבה must not be translated, with Dr. Taylor, "and diminish it exceedingly," for הרבה is here not an adverb, but it is taken as a substantive, and as the object in the sentence. The meaning is, "Make much little," by saying much in few words. G expresses this very well thus, ἐν ὀλίγοις πολλά.

(38) xxxii. 10. ולפני בוש חן. The י must be separated from בוש, and understood as an abbreviation of ינצח. We thus get the phrase, חן ולפני בוש ינצח, as in the preceding doublet of our verse the corresponding phrase reads, חן ולפני רכב ינצח חן.

(39) xxxv. 11. The marginal note, ומי בעל נמולות כי אם הוא. The expression בעל נמולות occurs in Isa. lix. 18, after the reading נמולות (מרי נמולות), as presented by the Targum (for נ' ג'), This affords, moreover, important evidence for that reading.

(40) xxxviii. 24. וחסר עסק הוא יתחכם. Besides the passages cited by Prof. Schechter (p. 62), and by Messrs. Neubauer and Cowley (p. xxvi), cf. *Mishnah Aboth*, II, 15, ולא כל המרבה בסחורה מחכים.

(41) xlix. 14. ונח הוא נלקח פנים. Prof. Schechter's conjecture, to read פנים, is not satisfactory. It is evident that פנים is a corrupt remnant of the words מעל פני האדמה (cf. Gen. vi. 7, vii. 4). This can still be recognized in G, ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

(42) l. 27. אשר ניבע בפתור לבן. The attempts made by Messrs. Schechter and Taylor to solve the difficulty arising from the word לבן are rather unsuccessful. At all events, לבו must be read for לבן. Prof. Schechter observes expressly that the ך of לבן was doubtful; so is the כ of בפתור, as he himself also remarks. I believe that the word was originally כפרת, and that a copyist, not understanding the phrase, transposed the letters and wrote כפתור, which then became בפתור. כפרת means here nothing else but "like the Euphrates," כפרת. Sirach, in his proud consciousness of having produced so great a wealth of wise sayings, says in this concluding phrase that he had made his heart flow like the Euphrates. It is the same figure of speech by which Sirach describes the wealth of teaching as furnished by the Torah, XXIV, 25-27. In that passage he alludes to five other rivers besides the Euphrates. The sentence

in which the Euphrates is mentioned runs as follows, *ὁ ἀναπληρῶν ὡς Εὐφράτης σύνεσι*; in S *וְהַיְהוּדִים מְבַרְכִּים אֶת הַיָּם הַזֶּה*. In Hebrew it would be כפרת תבונה הממלא (vid. 1 Chron. xii. 15). G, in our passage, comprises both sections of the verse, and translates, *ὁ ἀνώβρησε σοφίαν ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτοῦ*, omitting the simile of the Euphrates. In H the second section reads, וַאֲשֶׁר הִבִּיעַ בַּתְּבוּנוֹת. Here we have an intentional play upon the words הִבִּיעַ and נָבַע. The one word, in the Piel, which is not otherwise attested, means "to cause to flow," in the primary sense of the root, whilst הִבִּיעַ has the metaphorical meaning, well known from the Bible, of "to announce," "to proclaim." The object תְּבוּנוֹת is connected with the verb by the preposition ב. Cf. נָתַן בְּקוֹל Jer. xii. 8, Ps. xli. 7; הִרִים בְּקוֹל 1 Chron. xv. 16.

II. THE GREEK AND SYRIAC TRANSLATIONS.

iii. 16 H. וּמַכְעִים בּוֹרְאוֹ מְקַלֵּל אֹמוֹ. Both translations read וּמַקְלֵל בּוֹרְאוֹ הַכְעִים אֹמוֹ.

iii. 20. The verse added to v. 20 in some of the MSS. of G, *πολλοὶ εἰσιν ὑψηλοὶ καὶ ἐπίδοξοι* (v. l. *ὑψ. ἐνδοξοί*), ἀλλὰ πρᾶσις ἀποκαλύπτεται μυστήρια αὐτοῦ, agrees with the Hebrew text, except that the translator reads בִּי רַבִּים רָמִים וְבוֹהִים.

iii. 27. וּמַתְחִיל seems to have been rightly explained by Prof. Schechter, after Ps. xxxvii. 7 (וְהַתְחִילֵל), as "one who persists"; namely, in his frowardness. G took the word in the same sense, when he translated it *ἀμαρτωλός*. But S translates *وَمُتَعَبٍ* "one who shows temerity," a rendering based, perhaps, on the meaning of the word in Jer. xxiii. 19.

iii. 31. פועל טוב (= S *وَمُحِبٍّ*). G *ὁ ἀναποδιδούς χάριτας*, i. e. נֹמֵל טוֹב. Cf. Perles, *R. d. É. J.*, XXXV, 50.

iv. 1. For תלענ, G read תגול.

iv. 10. לֹאֲלַמְנוֹת; G *τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῶν*. He read לְאִמּוֹתָם.

iv. 12. וּמִבְקֶשִׁיָּה. G had in his text וּמִשְׁחַרְיָה and translated, *οἱ ὀρθρίζοντες πρὸς αὐτήν*. Vid. Ryssel, ad loc.

iv. 15. אֶמְתָּ. G read אֶמְתָּ (ἐμνη). S perhaps אֶמְתָּ (ἐμνη). For בַּחֲדֵרִי G read בְּמֶחָה (πεποιθώς). מִבֵּית in H is a marginal note, strayed into the text.

iv. 15-19. Both in H and S, Wisdom is introduced here in the first person, as speaking herself (the commencing words לִי שׁוֹמֵעַ recall Prov. i. 33). G applies throughout the third person, in continuation of the phraseology in ver. 11-14. In H ver. 17 וְלִפְנֵי אֲבָחֵנּוּ must be read instead of וּלְפָנִים יִבְחָרֵנּוּ.

iv. 25. Instead of **עם האל**, S and G read **עם האמת**. The second section of the verse (**ואל אלהים היבנע**) was read by S as **ומאולתך הפלא** ("refrain from thy folly"), whereas G read **הפלים** for **הכלא** ("be ashamed").

v. 1. G and S read **יש לי די** ("I have enough") instead of **יש לאל ידי**.

vi. 12. For **תשינך** (with **רעה** for its subject) G read **תשפל**, S **תפל**, and took it in the second person, omitting **רעה**.

vi. 29. **והבלתה** is parallel to **רשתה**, and therefore means "snare." We must read **וְהַבְלִיָּה** (without **ת**). Cf. Ps. cxl. 6; Job xviii. 10, or, perhaps, the plural **וְהַבְלִיָּה**. At any rate, the latter was the reading of G, who renders the word by **κλοιοί**. For **בגדי כחם**, G read **בגוד כבוד**, which was also the reading of S. But the latter translated **והבלתה** (**והבליה**) **לחכמי** ("she clothes thee"). The corresponding term would be **והלביתתך**.

vii. 4. **מושב כבוד** is translated in S **מבטח**. The first word is evidently an error for **מבטח**. Vid. Ryssel, ad loc.

vii. 11. **זכר** is omitted in G and S.

vii. 14. **תשנ** is the Jussive Kal of **שנה** (**השן**), correctly translated by G **δευτερώσης**. S however read **תשן**, and translates **למשכ**.

vii. 25. **ואל נכון גבר חברה**, "Associate her with a man of understanding" (**חפרה**). G **δώρησαι αὐτήν**, S **ואח**. Both read **הקיה**, "give her." The phrase in H is undoubtedly the original one. For the **חבר** construed with **אל** vid. also xii. 14; xiii. 2, 16, 17. Cf. **חברתך**, Mal. ii. 14, to designate the wife, the consort.

xii. 12. For **יהרפך** (which was translated by G), S read **יהפך** (i. e. **יהפך**), and translates **למשפך**.

xiii. 11. H **ושחק לך** = G **ὡς προσγελῶν**. S **סחלל**, "he tires thee." May he have read perhaps **שחק**, and taken this verb (which really means "to grind") in the sense of "fatiguing"?

xiii. 17. **לצדיק** is translated by S **לחכם**; he read, therefore, **לאיש צדיק**, which was perhaps the original reading, otherwise the second section of the verse would be too short.

xiii. 19. Both translators seem to have read **פראים במדבר** for **פראי מדבר**; the former may have been the original reading, in view of Job xxiv. 5.

xiv. 2. H **חסרתו**, which Schechter justly corrects into **חסרתו**. S has **חסל**, which is perhaps an error for **חסל**.

xiv. 17. For **חוק** (G **διαθήκη**), S read **דור**.

xiv. 26. For **קנו**, G read **בניו**.

xv. 6. H **ימצא** (for which G has no equivalent), S read **ימלא**.

xv. 8. In S, instead of **בְּפָנָיו**, read **בְּבִסָּם** (יזכרה).

xv. 13. H **לֹא יִאֲנֶנָּה**. Instead of this, G renders *καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαπητόν*. He evidently read **יִאֲהֶבָה**. About S, vid. Ryssel, ad loc.

xv. 19. **עֵינֵי אֵל יִרְאוּ מַעֲשָׂיו** (God's eyes see his creatures). Instead of this, G has *καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους αὐτόν*. He read, therefore, **עֵינֵי אֵל יִרְאוּ** and disregarded **מַעֲשָׂיו**. S gives a free translation of the Hebrew (**סְכַח מַחֲבֵן חֶסֶד וְטָמֵחַ**).

xvi. 4. In G **φουλῆ** (ממשפחת) must be read instead of **φουλῆ**.

xvi. 6. For **נִצָּחָה** (G *ἐξεκαύθη*), S has **מַחֲלָה**, and read, perhaps, **נִצָּחָה**.

xvi. 10. **כֵּן** (ὅτως) is rendered in S by **כֵּן וְכֵן**. He either took the word in the sense of **כֵּן**, or he read thus.

xxx. 13. For **עָלָיו** (i. e. **עָלָיו**), G and S read **עָלָיו**.

xxxi. 6. It seems that G read **והמוקש על פניהם** instead of **הבוטח על פנינים**.

xxxii. 9. For **ושרים**, S read **ושבים**, G **ואחרים**.

xxxii. 16. For **מנשף**, S read perhaps **מנפש** (**מנפח**), G **כננה** (*ὡς φῶς*).

III. THE ANCIENT QUOTATIONS FROM BAR-SIRA, IN THEIR RELATION TO THE GENIZAH FRAGMENTS.

I. Quotations by Saadiah.

In the introduction to the *Sefer Haggal'li*, which is still extant (edited by Harkavy, *Leben und Werke Saadja Gaon's*, I, 150-181), Saadiah names Simon b. Jeshuah b. Eleazar b. Sira as the author of a book on morals, similar to the biblical book of Proverbs (p. 150 (ספר מוסר הרומה לספר משלי)). He therefore designates Bar-Sira by the same full name, as found in the Fragments edited by Prof. Schechter (l. 27). Saadiah cited from this book seven sentences (pp. 176-178), which are almost all found in our fragments.

The first quotation (Saadiah himself numbers the citations) occurs in v. 5, 6, and there is a complete agreement between the quotation and the text in H, with the single exception of the last word. For Saadiah has **וְעַל רִשְׁעִים יִנוּחַ עֵזוֹ**, whilst we read in H **וְעַל רִשְׁעִים** (sic) **וְאֵל רִנּוֹ**. R. Nissim of Kairuwan also quotes this saying of Ben Sira, in *Sefer Maasiyôth* (vid. Harkavy, p. 201 sq.), and also has **עֵזוֹ** for **רִנּוֹ**. It is highly probable that R. Nissim derived his quotations from Saadiah. The original reading is **רִנּוֹ**, which is also confirmed by G (*ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ*) and S (**רִנּוֹ**).

The second quotation of Saadiah reads, **רבים יהיו אנשי שלומך גלה**

אנשי שלומך יהיו רבים ובעל סודך. In H we read, סודך לאחד מני אלף אחד. The Hebrew quotation from Sirach occurs also in the Babylonian Talmud (*Jebamoth*, 63 b, *Sanhedrin*, 100 b)¹. The first section of the verse reads, רבים יהיו דורשי שלומך. In *Sanhedrin* there is דורשי מבקשי (Rabbinowicz, *Dikd. Soferim*, IX, 304). דורשי 'ש' is an old *varia lectio* for אנשי 'ש'. It does not, however, give an appropriate sense, and the latter reading is reproduced in G, οἱ ἐπιζητούντες σοί. S renders the reading of the Talmud thus, **מלכך מלכך**. In S we also find the different sequence of the words as in H, the subject being placed at the beginning of the sentence. As to the second section of the verse, Saadiah's text is in accord with the Talmudic quotation (נלה סודך), whilst the reading in H (בעל סודך) is directly confirmed by G and S. It is, evidently, the original reading, for the meaning of בעל סודך is in harmony with אנשי שלומך.

The third quotation of Saadiah's is the sentence immediately following, namely vi. 7, 8. It agrees with H to the letter; only that Saadiah has, instead of נפסי (vid. supra, ad vi. 7), the Biblical מַפָּה, which has the identical meaning, and for ואל יעמד more correctly ולא יעמד.

The fourth quotation of Saadiah (xi. 28) is not extant in H. Saadiah's text agrees with G, except that the Greek translator translated באחריתו by ἐν τέκνοις αὐτοῦ. He attributed, perhaps, the same meaning to the word as it bears in Ps. cix. 13 (אחריתו, LXX τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ). Vid. also Targum and Commentaries to Amos iv. 2.

Saadiah's fifth quotation (vi. 13) accords exactly with H, with the exception that Saadiah has הִזְהִיר, and H הִשְׁמִיר. In xxxii. 22 H has also הִזְהִיר.

Saadiah's sixth quotation (xvi. 17) differs from H only in this, that in the former, at the end of the whole passage, the words כל בני אדם, which, as a matter of fact, destroy the rhythm, are absent. In G the words are also missing; we find them, however, in S. Further, Saadiah has או מי נפשי, instead of ומה נפשי. The latter is the original reading, for G gives τὸ γὰρ, and S **אם כן**.

Saadiah's seventh quotation reads, כי ברב שיח מנסה אותך ושחק לך, כי מהרבות שיחו נסיון. The first section of the verse reads in H, כי מהרבות שיחו נסיון. Saadiah's text agrees with G, and H agrees with S. But G seems to have read מרב שיח (not ברב שיח).

Saadiah, in his Introduction to the *Sefer Haggalut*, mentions also the work of a certain Eleazar b. Irai (בן עיראי), which was similar to the book of Ecclesiastes (Harkavy, p. 150). He quotes three sentences

¹ The quotations in Jellinek's *Beth-Hammidrash*, V, 142, are taken from the Talmud.

from that work, the first of which occurs also in Saadiah's Introduction to his commentary of *Sefer Yetsira* (p. 6, ed. M. Lambert), and Eleazar b. Irai is again named as the author. But this sentence is also found in Ben Sira; it is the saying in iii. 21, 22, the Hebrew original of which is also cited in the Talmud and the Midrash, and, indeed, distinctly as a saying of Ben Sira. The latter circumstance must have certainly been known to Saadiah, and this, coupled with the fact that this saying must have also occurred in the Hebrew text of Sirach which he had before him, makes it appear particularly strange that he did not include it in his quotations from Sirach. Having found the sentence also in the work of Eleazar b. Irai, it is possible that he intentionally named the latter only as its author, in order to borrow some important saying from his work also. The fact that this saying, which belongs undoubtedly to Ben Sira, occurred also in Ben Irai's book, now lost, proves that the latter contained also genuine sentences borrowed from Ben Sira's book. Of course, it cannot now be decided whether an author of the name of אלעזר בן עיראי really existed, whether the latter name is not a corrupt shortening of that of Ben Sira (סיראי from עיראי), and whether the book of Ben Irai, used by Saadiah, was anything else but a compilation, which bore originally Ben Sira's name, and contained also ancient sayings of Ben Sira. As to the text of the quotation, we shall have an opportunity to further consider it.

Saadiah's quotations from Sirach lead us to the conclusion that, as a matter of fact, the Gaon had before a Hebrew text of the Sirach, which was essentially identical with the text of the Genizah fragments. The latter differed only externally from Saadiah's text, in as far as the latter, as expressly stated by Saadiah, was provided with vowel-points and accents, and had, therefore, quite the appearance of a Biblical text. A few traces of punctuation are also preserved in the Genizah fragments. At all events, Saadiah furnishes us with irrefragable evidence that the Hebrew Sirach was still extant at the beginning of the tenth century in the form in which it was discovered at the present time; that it is, therefore, out of the question to assume, with Prof. Margoliouth, an artificial restoration of the Hebrew Sirach in the eleventh century.

2. Quotations in the Babylonian Talmud.

We have in the Babylonian Talmud a whole series of quotations from the Hebrew Sirach, and, indeed, partly with the designation "as written in the book of Ben Sira" (כתוב בספר בן סירא). Some of these quotations occur in the Genizah fragments.

1. *Chagiga*, 13a :

1 בנרול ממך אל תדרוש בחזק ממך אל תחקור

2 במופלא ממך בל תרע במכוסה ממך בל תשאול

3 במה שהרשית התבונן ואין לך עסק בנסתרות

This quotation (Sirach iii. 21, 22) occurs also in Palestinian documents; namely, in *Genesis Rabba*, VIII, and *Jer. Chagiga*, 77 c, where the Amoraite Eleazar (ben Pedath) cites the saying in the name of Ben Sira. The text in *Genesis Rabba* is identical with that of the Babylonian Talmud; the former quotation has evidently been brought into accord with that of the latter. In the Jerusalem Talmud the whole of the first line is missing. The second line reads פליאה ממך בליאה מה תרע עמוקה משאול מה תחקור. This is a modification of the sentence in view of Job xi. 8. In Saadiah's quotation, given by him as emanating from "Ben Irai" (v. supra), the first line is also missing, but the verbs occurring in the latter are employed in the second line, which reads thus במופלא ממך אל תדרוש במכוסה ממך אל תחקור. In this form we find the second line also in H (where the first line is also missing); but we have פלאות for במופלא, and מכוסה for מכוסה. In both old versions, G and S, the text of the Babylonian Talmud was reproduced¹, the second line is entirely missing. The result of this comparison is as follows: The first half of our saying was extant in two versions, the one is reproduced in G and S, the other appears, in a modified form, in the text of the Palestinian Talmud. The Babylonian Talmud (and, thence, *Genesis Rabba*) combined both versions. Lines 1 and 2 are, therefore, doubles, such as occur frequently in the fragments. Saadiah and H reproduce the Palestinian version. I observe in addition that, in the second line, the word תרע must be explained as the completion of an abbreviation 'תר' (for תדרש). Cf. the quotations from Midrash Haggadol and Midrash Konen by Prof. Schechter, JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, IV, 699.

2. Sirach vi. 6, quoted *Jebamoth*, 63 b, *Sanhedrin*, 100 b. Vid. supra, the second quotation from Sirach by Saadiah.

3. Sirach xiii. 15 (xxvii. 9), quoted in *Baba Kama*, 92 b, with the formula משולש בכתובים (דכתיב), i. e. as a Hagiographical sentence. The quotation reads כל עוף למינו ישכון וכן (v. l. ובני) אדם לדומה לו. This sentence is not found thus, either in H, or in G and S. The first section of the verse occurs in a different connexion in Sirach xxvii. 9, πετεινὰ πρὸς τὰ ὅμοια αὐτοῖς καταλύσει (= כל עוף לרמה לו ישכון). S has for this (עוף השמים למינו ישכון) פִּסְלָן מַחֲלָה מַחֲלָה מַחֲלָה. In Sirach xiii. 15 the first section reads in H כל הבשר יאהב מינו; and

¹ Only that they also read במופלא for בנרול.

the first half of the following verse מִיִּן כָּל בֶּשֶׂר אֲצִלּוֹ. The second half of xiii. 15 reads וְכָל הָאָדָם אֶת הָרֹמָה לוֹ; and of xiii. 16 וְאֵל מִיָּנִי 16. Our quotation seems to be a free combination of xxvii. 9 a and xiii. 15 a.

4. Sirach xlii. 9, 10; quoted *Sanhedrin*, 100 b. In the fragments (Oxford edition, p. 12) the passage in question is preserved in a mutilated form, but the remnants show no evidence that the text, as quoted in the Talmud, differs considerably from that in H. The latter is more in accord with G than with that of the Babylonian Talmud.

5. Rab quotes (evidently from Sirach vii. 10) the saying בָּצַר אֵל Erubin, 65 a. According to my surmise (*Die Agada der bab. Amoräer*, p. 28) the quotation read originally בָּצַר אֵל יִתְפַּלֵּל or הִמְיָצַר אֵל יִתְפַּלֵּל. In H the corresponding sentence reads אֵל תִּתְקַצֵּר בַּתְּפִלָּה.

6. The same Rab exhorts his pupil Hamnuna to rejoice in benefits bestowed in view of the perishableness of everything human, *Erubin*, 54 a. The exhortation consists of sentences taken from Sirach xiv. 11-18. I place the corresponding passages together, in order to render the differences more conspicuous.

Rab.	Sirach H.
1 בני אדם יש לך היטב לך	11 בני אדם יש לך . . . היטב לך
2 שאין (כי אין v. l.) בשאול תענוג	12 וזכור כי לא בשאול תענוג
3 ואין למות התמהמה (ול' א' ה' v. l.)	ולא מות יתמהמה
4 ואם תאמר אניה לבני	
5 חוק בשאול מי יגיד (יורה v. l.) לך	וחוק לשאול מי יגיד לך
6 בני האדם דומים לעשבי השדה	18 כפרה עלה על עין רענן . . .
(הארמה v. l.)	
7 הללו נוצצין והללו נובלין	כן דורות בשר ודם אחד נוע ואחד גומל

We see that, in Rab's words, lines 1, 2, 3, 5, are exactly like those in H. Line 4 is absent in H, but it agrees somewhat with v. 15, הלא לאחר תענוב חילך. The last two lines are, as to the sense, in agreement with v. 18. G and S agree with H.

From the foregoing examples it is evident that the quotations from Ben Sira in the Babylonian Talmud are partly original. At all events, the text of the Hebrew Sirach, as used by the Babylonian Amoraites, whilst containing much which accorded with the text of the fragments, contained also much which was not found at all, or found in a different way, in the latter.

3. Quotations in Palestinian documents.

1. Eleazar b. Pedath quotes in *Jer. Chagiga*, 77 c, Sirach iii. 21, 22; also in *Genesis Rabba*, VIII. Vid. previous section, No. 1.

2. The same Amoraite quotes Sirach xxxviii. 1 a; according to one source (*Tanchuma*, מִקֵּץ, at the end) he states expressly that it "was written in the book of Ben Sira," according to another (*Exodus Rabba*, XXI, 7) he gives it as a proverb (הַמֶּשֶׁל אוֹמֵר); in *Jer. Taanith*, 66 d, at the top, there is no allegation whatever, as if it were a saying of Eleazar himself (equally *Pesikta Rabbathi*, XXV, 127 a). The quotations in *Tanchuma* and in *Jerushalmi* are in the Aramaic language, in both other sources they are in Hebrew. H reads רעה רופא לפני צרכו. The marginal note has צרכך for צרכו, and רעי for רעה. The reading רעה is certainly the correct one. The Palestinian quotation has, instead of this word, פִּיֵּר, Aramaic אִוִּיר, and the versions have also τιμα, حَمْد. In spite of such harmony, רעה can be the original reading; we must then assume that at early times already פִּיֵּר had been substituted for רעה, which had become unintelligible. Ben Sira used the term רעה—which is an alliteration with רופא—somewhat in the sense of "to associate," "to have intercourse with¹." "Have intercourse with the physician, before thou wantest him." Later, the more lucid expression פִּיֵּר was put for רעה. For לפני צרכך, which appears in H in the marginal note, the equivalent עד שלא was put. S paraphrases ح. لا يحسن ح. Probably, G had originally πρὸς τῆς χρείας αὐτοῦ, which is equivalent to לפני צרכו in H. This became πρὸς τὰς χρείας αὐτοῦ, but αὐτοῦ having lost all meaning, τιμαῖς was inserted, as much as to say, "with his honours, with the honours due to him."

3. In *Genesis Rabba*, XXII, 8, a saying is quoted in Aramaic, which is cited in *Tanchuma*, חֲקַת, init. (not, however, in Buber's text of *Tanchuma*), as a saying of Ben Sira. It runs as follows, טב לביש לא תעביר ובישא לא ימטי לך. The second part of this apophthegm agrees with Sirach vii. 16, ואל ישיגך רעה (G καὶ οὐ μὴ σε καταλάβῃ κακόν, S ولا يعصى حبل). The first half would be in Hebrew, טובה אל תעש, לרע. But for this H presents, אל תעש לך רעה. We may, perhaps, assume that לך is a corruption of לר (=לרע), that the word טובה disappeared, and that רעה was added for the purpose of completing

¹ Cf. Prov. xiii. 20; xxviii. 7. It is not necessary to suppose that רעה is an Arabism in the sense of "honouring" (Lévi, *Revue des Études Juives*, XXXIX, 4).

the phrase. G and S reproduce the Hebrew text **אל תעש רעה**. But G read perhaps originally, **ἐὺ καὶ κακῶ**, and S **لا احرص**.

4. Referring to Gen. xxxi. 2 ("Jacob saw the face of Laban"), *Genesis Rabba*, LXXIII, 12, cites a saying of Ben Sira, **לב אדם ישנה**, פניו בין למוי בין לרע. This is thus found in Sirach xiii. 25, only that in H **אנוש** occurs for **אדם**, and **ואם . . . ובין** for **אם . . . ואם**. G and S entirely agree with H.

5. In *Genesis Rabba*, X, 6, the following is cited as a saying of Ben Sira:

- 1 **אלוה העלה סמים מן הארץ**
- 2 **בהם הרופא מרפא את המכה**
- 3 **ומהם הרוקח מרקח את המרקחת**

According to H the text of these lines (xxxviii. 4 a, 7 a, 8 a) reads thus:

- 1 **אל מארץ ברא סמים (מוציא תרופות v. l.)**
- 2 **בהם רופא יניח מכאוב**
- 3 **וכן רוקח עושה מרקחת**

In (1) G has **ἐκτίσεν** like in H; thus also S **ב.ל**. (2) is in S the same as in H, and also L *in his curans mitigavit dolorem*; G reproduces something like **בהם הרופא יניח את עמלו**. In (3) both G and S translate the verb **עושה**, which occurs in H. The word **מרקח** of the quotation is not, therefore, original. **וכן** in H = **סוף** in S.

The five examples cited here make it evident that the text in H, although differing from that from which the Palestinian sources of traditional literature quote Ben Sira, yet is not essentially at variance with it.

W. BACHER.

Budapest.